

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 25, 2007. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 9 are amended. New Claims 11 to 31 have been added. No new matter has been added by such amendments or new claims. A petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time to respond to the Office Action and a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement are submitted herewith. Please charge deposit account number 02-1818 for any fees which are due in connection with this Response, the Extension of Time, and the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 4, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,393,057 to Marnell ("Marnell"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections. Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended certain of the claims for clarity.

Marnell discloses presenting a main game of video poker, comparing winning hands from the main game to predetermined bonus hands (wherein each of the predetermined bonus hands are associated with at least one bingo cell). Marnell also discloses determining whether the winning hands from the main game correspond to the bonus hands, and if so, associating an entry with the corresponding bingo cells and awarding a bonus winning **only if all** of the bingo cells in a predetermined set of bingo cells have entries associated therewith. Marnell discloses initiating play of the bonus event **automatically** on the occurrence of a match between a winning hand of a main game and one or more of the bonus hands. When such a match occurs, the gaming machine either randomly selects one of the matching bonus hands or requires a player to select one of the matching bonus hands. An entry is then associated with the selected bingo cell. If all of the bingo cells in a predetermined set of bingo cells are selected, a bonus winning is awarded. The secondary games disclosed by Marnell is a "bingo" or "bingo-type" game which includes game simulations which are based upon, connected with, or derived from, a conventional bingo game. See Marnell, column 5, lines 27 to 30.

In Marnell, the bonus event is played after determining an outcome of the main game and **only if** a match occurs between a winning player hand and a predetermined category of the bonus event. Marnell does not appear to disclose **receiving an input from the player** which causes play of a bonus event, wherein play of the bonus event includes a chance to win a bonus winning, and wherein the **input is independent** of whether the winning hand corresponds to any of the predetermined bonus categories.

The method of amended Claim 1 includes, among other elements, if the main game hand is a predetermined winning hand, awarding the player a winning amount and determining if the winning hand corresponds to any of a plurality of predetermined bonus categories. If so, the method further includes associating a value with the corresponding bonus category, and **receiving an input from the player** at a time after placing the wager, and **the input causing play of a bonus event**. The play of the bonus event includes a random selection of at least one of the bonus categories and awarding a bonus winning according to the value, if any, associated with the at least one selected bonus category. In the method of Claim 1, the **input is independent** of whether the winning hand corresponds to any of the plurality of predetermined bonus categories. For example, in one embodiment of the method in accordance with Claim 1, the player can initiate play of the bonus event and have a chance of winning an award even if the previous play of the main game was a losing hand.

Furthermore, Marnell does not disclose play of a bonus event wherein play of the bonus event includes a **random selection** of at least one of the bonus categories and awarding a bonus winning according to the value, if any, associated with the at least one **selected bonus category**. On the other hand, the method of amended Claim 1 includes play of a bonus event wherein play of the bonus event includes a **random selection** of at least one of the bonus categories and awarding a bonus winning according to the value, if any, associated with the at least one **selected bonus category**. As stated above, the secondary game of Marnell is a "bingo" or "bingo-type" game which includes game simulations which are based upon, connected with, or derived from, a conventional bingo game. Marnell discloses that each of a plurality of bingo cells of a bingo matrix is associated with a bonus hand. When a match occurs

between a winning hand of a main game and one of the bonus hands associated with the bingo cells, an entry is associated with the corresponding bingo cell. Once all of the bingo cells in a predetermined set of bingo cells have values associated therewith, a bonus winning is awarded wherein the bonus winning amount is based on values associated with the bonus hands corresponding to the bingo cells in the predetermined set of bingo cells. In Marnell, whether a bonus winning is awarded appears to be **dependent** on whether **all** of the bingo cells in a predetermined set of bingo cells have entries associated therewith. Therefore, Marnell does not appear to disclose a **random selection** of at least one of the bonus categories and awarding a bonus winning according to the value associated with the **selected bonus categories**.

For at least these reasons, amended independent Claim 1 is patently distinguished over Marnell and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 10, and amended Claims 3, 4, and 9 depend directly and indirectly from amended independent Claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons given with respect to amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 2 and 10, and amended Claims 3, 4, and 9 are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 5 to 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marnell as applied to at least claims 1 to 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,419,579 to Bennett ("Bennett").

As described above, Marnell discloses presenting a main game of video poker, comparing winning hands from the main game to predetermined bonus hands, wherein each of the predetermined bonus hands are associated with at least one bingo cell, determining whether the winning hands from the main game correspond to the bonus hands and, if so, associating an entry with the corresponding bingo cells, and awarding a bonus winning **only if all** of the bingo cells in a predetermined set of bingo cells have entries associated therewith. Marnell discloses initiating play of the bonus event **automatically** on the occurrence of a match between a winning hand of a main game and one or more of the bonus hands. When such a match occurs, the gaming machine either randomly selects one of the matching bonus hands or requires a player to select one of the matching bonus hands. An entry is then associated with the selected bingo

cell. If all of the bingo cells in a predetermined set of bingo cells are selected, a bonus winning is awarded.

Bennett discloses a bonus event wherein a symbol, such as one or more dice, is displayed to indicate a multiplier, which is used in combination with a value generated in a main game to determine an additional payout amount.

Page 4 of the Office Action states that Marnell is "silent regarding the utilization of two dice to determine a multiplier utilized in combination with a bonus winning to determine an additional payout amount." The Office Action further states that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated the utilization of dice to determine a supplemental prize multiplier as taught by Bennett into the invention of Marnell in order to maintain a player's interest in a gaming machine as taught by Bennett." Regardless of whether it would have been obvious to incorporate the utilization of dice to determine a supplemental prize multiplier into Marnell, Bennett does not cure the deficiencies of Marnell as described above.

Accordingly, for this reason and for the reasons given with respect to amended independent Claim 1, Claims 5 to 8 are patently distinguished over Marnell in combination with Bennett and are in condition for allowance.

New independent Claims 11 and 21 are supported by the specification at least on pages 13 to 16, 18, 19, 22 to 25, 27, 30 to 32, and 55 to 58, and in Figures 2 and 6 to 9. Neither Marnell nor Bennett individually, nor the gaming system resulting from the combination of Marnell and Bennett disclose the elements of Claims 11 and 21.

New Claims 12 to 20 and 22 to 31 depend directly or indirectly from new independent Claims 11 and 21, respectively, and are allowable for similar reasons given with respect to Claim 11. For at least the reasons stated above, new independent Claims 11 and 21 and new Claims 12 to 20 and 22 to 31 are patently distinguished over Marnell and Bennett and are in condition for allowance.


Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 to 31, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art, such action is courteously

solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Adam H. Masia

Reg. No. 35,602

Customer No. 29159

Dated: December 13, 2007